

Date

ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP

28 APR 1981

TO: (Name, office symbol, room number, building, Agency/Post)	Initials	Date
1. ADDA	N	4-28
2. DD/A		4/29
3. DDA/MS		4/30
4. DDA REGISTRY: File DD/A 81-0707		
5.		

Action	File	Note and Return
Approval	For Clearance	Per Conversation
As Requested	For Correction	Prepare Reply
Circulate	For Your Information	See Me
Comment	Investigate	Signature
Coordination	Justify	

REMARKS

Attached, as requested, are the 12 recommendations of our recent study on recruitment and applicant processing activities. Following each is a short discussion of the recommendation, and some recent information as well.



DO NOT use this form as a RECORD of approvals, concurrences, disposals, clearances, and similar actions

FROM: (Name, org. symbol, Agency/Post)

Management Staff, DDA

Room No.—Bldg.

7C18 Hqs

Phone No.

Recommendation 1:

Give the newly implemented OPPPM system six months to prove its mettle.

Self-explanatory. Several changes in the system are so new that we have no firm basis to say they are successful. Time and accurate recordkeeping should help us make a judgment.

OPPPM agrees.

Recommendation 2:

Use computer modeling as a tool for understanding, not for decisionmaking.

Also self-explanatory. A model preserves the institution which it models. It contributes greatly to an understanding of the process. But at most in decisionmaking, it should act only as one of many factors.

OPPPM agrees.

Recommendation 3:

Evaluate the overall effectiveness of the Agency's field recruitment network and take appropriate action.

Recommendation is for an evaluation only at this point. It is time to examine the field recruitment structure and determine if this is the method we want to use to recruit.

OPPPM disagrees with the arguments we used in the study to point up this need.

We stand by our recommendation.

Recommendation 4:

Reconfigure the OPPPM Review Unit and Processing Assistants functions to increase the efficiency with which they process applicant files. Ensure that applicants are contacted frequently during processing, and are continually assured of Agency interest.

Self-explanatory. These are known OPPPM bottlenecks and OPPPM is currently working on the problem.

Recommendation 5:

Direct the Office of Security to implement an up-front polygraph program for all applicants.

OS has agreed to begin this activity as soon as directed to do so. It should result in a decrease in the number of background investigations conducted for applicants.

OPPPM recommended this same action as part of its March 1980 study.

Recommendation 6:

Fund Project SCIP, Security Communications Improvement Project now. It will allow OS to more efficiently process background investigations.

DDA and OS are beginning action on this project which involves partial automation of the Security Field Offices. A pilot program is being discussed for implementation at the Washington Field Office.

Recommendation 7:

Retain the 15-year investigative coverage on applicant background investigations.

I requested that the 15-year span on the background investigation be examined. We've decided on no changes to the length of coverage, as it has little impact on processing time but has significant security implications.

Recommendation 8:

Direct OMS to explore with OPPPM the creation of physical activity job standards, especially for sedentary jobs. Having done so, the clinical portion of medical processing for applicants to be assigned to these jobs could be eliminated. If deemed necessary, the clinical processing could be postponed until sometime after EOD.

This Recommendation was for a study only; however, we have deferred action primarily because of the larger issue it raises. The Agency currently hires on the "whole man" concept - that is, a person hired as staff is cleared from both security and medical standpoints to perform any job in the Agency. If we relax the medical aspect of that concept, we may at some point be legally required to relax the

security aspect as well. Aside from this vital consideration, OMS has agreed that the recommendation is workable.

OPPPM believed that post-EOD physicals may raise other legal issues as well.

Recommendation 9:

Direct the Office of Medical Services to use the recently established Communications recruitment task force as a pilot program for implementation of a similar pre-medical screening program for all applicants.

OMS has agreed to assess this type of medical screening for possible application to applicant processing. Any conclusions have been deferred until the task force completes its efforts.

Recommendation 10:

Direct the Office of Medical Services to offer the PATB on an exception only basis, and to curtail its use for most college hires.

The decision to require a PATB is made by individual components. Therefore, OMS will survey components to determine their needs for the PATB. We expect some decline in the number of PATBs given as a result.

OPPPM supports the PATB as a tool for assessment of the applicant's needs and abilities.

Recommendation 11:

Curtail invitee travel expenses, by better accounting, reallocation of monies, and less interview activity.

Recommendation 11 was made prior to the recent projections for a significant increase in EODs. It was also made prior to the FY-83 budget completion. The impact of a larger number of EODs than originally anticipated on invitee travel is obvious.

There is no disagreement that because of increased expenses accounting for invitee travel has to be tracked to a greater degree than previously required.

Recommendation 12:

Reexamine the Agency's policy on payment of relocation expenses in light of the limited success of non-Washington area recruiting activity. Pending the outcome of such an examination, examine the feasibility of implementing one standard Agency policy to pay all relocation expenses. At the very least, identify additional occupational codes for which we should apply for an OPM exemption in order to pay relocation expenses.

This is essentially a legal question, which has not surfaced in several years. The recommendation varies because of the legal aspects of the question.

We urge that the recommendation be pursued.

CONFIDENTIAL

DD/A 81-0707/7

[24 JUL 1981]

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director of Central Intelligence

FROM: Max Hugel
Deputy Director for Administration

SUBJECT: Review of Recruitment Process

CIA REGISTRY
FILE: Pers-15

1. This memorandum forwards copies of a recent DDA study on recruitment and an associated Office of Personnel Policy, Planning, and Management (OPPPM) memorandum for your information only.
2. Earlier this year, I commissioned a short study on the cost effectiveness and efficiency of the recruitment process, specifically the DDA portions of that activity. The study, completed in March 1981, surfaced some areas for consideration in the two involved DDA offices, the Office of Security and the Office of Medical Services, and in some of the OPPPM activities as well.
3. I am prepared at this point to implement recommendations in two areas:
 - The Office of Security can begin an up-front polygraph program, which is defined as a polygraph examination given prior to the security background investigation. This should contribute to a decrease in the number of required background investigations, a lengthy expensive process.
 - The Office of Medical Services has agreed to survey components who request the Professional Aptitude Test Battery (PATB) examination for their applicants to determine if their requirements for the test continue. We expect to see a reduction in the number of PATBs administered as a result of this review.

Downgrade to UNCLASSIFIED
When Separated from Attachments

CONFIDENTIAL

DD/A 81-0707/8

21 April 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Administration

FROM: Harry E. Fitzwater
Director of Personnel
Policy, Planning, and Management

SUBJECT: Review of Recruitment Process

REFERENCE: Your Memo (DDA 81-0707/6), dtd 15 April 1981,
Same Subject

Max:

1. When we talked last week about the subject, Review of the Recruitment Process, I had not had an opportunity to read it. As you will recall, in response to your desire to send it to the other Deputy Directors, I suggested it be attached to our paper for the Executive Committee.

2. After reading the Review I withdraw that suggestion and return it to you to be distributed as you see fit. Although there are some recommendations that I endorse, e.g., one, two and four (which is being done), I have trouble with the others. There are inaccuracies, misperceptions, omissions and speculations in the paper that I do not want to compound by appearing to endorse the Review.

3. At first blush several of the recommendations and their supporting comments appear to make sense. Deeper analysis may indicate otherwise. For example, it is easy to compare the number of professionals recruited by WARO against the Field Recruiters. What the paper fails to discuss is the difference in qualifications of the professionals. Generally, WARO handles the entry-level BA graduate who is in town looking for a job. On the other hand the recruiter is out beating the bushes for the hard-to-get individual who is being sought by both the private and public sectors, i.e., engineers, computer science personnel, economists, CT's, etc. There are other inaccuracies about the recruiters and their mode of operations, i.e., only "work standard hour days" and no "expense account." It is disturbing to read that "all" of our optimization activity has been centered on the processing portion which implies nothing has been done in the field which is a gross misstatement.

4. Recommendations 8 and 10 are very troublesome since they impact on the suitability and quality of employees entering on duty. It is highly doubtful that the directorates and components who now rely on the PATB for a better

understanding of the qualifications of professional applicants will be agreeable to dropping the PATB tests. A few years ago I thought this was necessary in order to speed up the hiring process and cut expenses for entry of CT's. What I quickly learned is that you cannot depend on College SAT scores. The applicant may have gone through college with a 3.5 average but cannot read nor write. Another disturbing recommendation, number 8, is that we eliminate the clinical portion of medical processing for those involved in sedentary jobs until the person has entered on duty. I can assure you that this could result in not only a higher cost to the Government but also in legal cases. It can be predicted that it will be necessary to terminate individuals who are found to have a serious medical problem after entering on duty. This problem is compounded if the individual has sold his/her house and has quit his/her job to move to Washington.

5. I agree that the invitee travel must be better controlled and we are working toward this end. The paper fails to note that we are trying to improve the staffing requirements to ensure that vacancies do indeed exist before an applicant is invited in to Washington. Also, the pre-investigative interviews by security and medical representatives and the task force approach for technical testing, pre-polying and medical exams in the field will reduce unnecessary invitee travel. The Review suggests that invitee travel is skyrocketing despite front-end screening. The paper fails to note that this is directly attributable to a large increase in positions, [REDACTED] Also, there has been a significant increase in travel costs. At present it costs on the average \$450 per trip. We estimate that this will increase to \$507 by FY 1983. I have not seen a projection of 2.68M for invitee travel in FY 1983 but assume this was a figure initially being considered [REDACTED] for a projected increase [REDACTED] in FY 83. Below is a comparison of EOD's that required invitee travel during the period FY 1979-80 and projected through FY 1983:

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>TOTAL EOD'S</u>	<u>EOD'S REQUIRING INVITEE TRAVEL</u>	<u>INVITEE TRAVEL FUNDS \$ K</u>
FY 79	[REDACTED]		
FY 80			
FY 81			
FY 82			
FY 83			

Current Package
Projected Package

It must be noted that all people provided travel are not hired. Nevertheless, it may be cheaper in the long run to spend \$500 on travel to save several thousands by not hiring the wrong applicant.

6. I know this memorandum is quite negative toward the report, but the concerns noted above and others are so serious that I could not let the paper stand unchallenged.



Harry E. Fitzwater

STAT